A Note on *Joseph Andrews* (2)

Megumu Hirata

III

The heroes of *Joseph Andrews* are travelling heroes, and so the novel has been counted among the picaresque novels or the novels of action. No doubt it is in a sense. Travelling heroes, accidents all happening to them, and that chiefly owing to their poverty, the final coming through of the heroes, depiction of the low people, heroes as social outcasts or outsiders; these are indeed the most remarkable features of the picaresque novels and mostly of *Joseph Andrews*. Though Joseph at last turns out to be a born gentleman and no outcast, he is literally cast out of the house of Lady Booby at the beginning of the novel, and throughout the journey he has no social fulcrum to help him. Abraham Abams, who has a more claim to the hero of the novel, is often taken to be a vagabond and a beggar because of his short, ragged cassock which he tore 'ten years ago in passing over a stile.' But whereas the reciprocally independent and unrelated events in a picaresque novel are simply pieced together by a single hero to whom they invariably happen without organic unity, the apparently 'picaresque' incidents in *Joseph Andrews* co-operate towards the central theme of the novel.[1]

In the "Preface to *David Simple*" (1744), Fielding defends her sister's novel saying that though 'the fable consists of a series of separate adventures, detached from and independent on each other, yet all tend(ing) to one great end; so that those who should object want of unity of action here may, if they please, or if they dare, fly back with their objection in the face even of *Odyssey* itself,'[2] and further adds that 'every episode bears a manifest impression of the principal design.' We may justly regard this as a supplement to his famous preface to *Joseph Andrews* where he asserts that his is 'a comic epic-poem in prose' and his protagonists Odysseys afoot. So his defence of David Simple is also applicable to his own work.

What, then, is 'the principal design' or 'the one great end' to which the separate adventures are all tending in *Joseph Andrews?* According to the author, it is to rip off the masks of affectation and to penetrate to the truth which lies hidden behind them. Thus, as I have discussed before,[3] Fielding shows up the emptiness and stupidity of those who believe in the omnipotence of money for keeping their respectability, or those who count on knowledge, learning, or the experience of London life, etc., to distinguish themselves. He also exposes the wickedness and cruelty of the hypocritical high in contrast with the unchecked flow of good-nature and kindness among the

low. But the exposition of 'reality' hidden behind the affected 'appearance' is not all. If the ripping off of the masks is the thesis of the book as Fielding affirms, the positive setting forth of the example is the thematic motif as well. This is very important. Our author differs in this very point from the traditional picaresque writers such as the author of *Lazarillo de Tormes,* the author of *Gil Blas,* or Smollett in *Roderick Random*. On their first entrance on the stage, picaresque heroes are inexperienced and innocent, but soon they come to realize that they must cheat and make the most of every opportunity to live. This is the maxim of the picaroons. They make shifts to get their bread, and at the same time show us the cruelty and wickedness of the people around them. But the picaroons have no positive principles of their own, and therefore are rather passive and more at the mercy of Fortune. This is not the case with our heroes, who are no rogues but each an embodiment of a good Christian.

'Your virtue!' cries Lady Booby quite taken aback when she is flatly refused by Joseph. In the age of the 'double standard of morals', when men did not seem to scruple to indulge in illicit amours, it was considered ridiculous for a man to decline the advances made by a woman,[4] especially when she was higher in status. Lady Booby continues,

> 'I am out of patience,'. . . 'did ever mortal hear of a man's virtue? Did ever the greatest, or the gravest men pretend to any of this kind? Will magistrates who punish lewdness, or parsons who preach against it, make any scruple of committing it?' (I, 8)

This is the typical posture of those who adhere to the moral code of the day, which Fielding could by no means admit. The author represents Joseph not as a mere individual, nor Lady Booby an individual woman. When Joseph resolutely rejects the temptation by his mistress, he immediately defies the prevailing moral code which the lady stands for. He is, as it were, an embodiment of (male) chastity. In the early chapters, Fielding carefully gives us such passages as '(the example) of Joseph, my namesake,'(I, 10) or 'Joey, whom for a good reason we shall hereafter call JOSEPH,'(I, 5) which denote his intention of making Joseph a morally ideal person. It is pointed out by some critics that these passages will without fail remind a Christian reader of the biblical JOSEPH withstanding the allurements of Potiphar's wife.[5] Fielding, in an attempt to save Joseph from the accusation of being stupid and insensible, once makes Joseph confess in a letter to Pamela that at the charms of Lady Booby he has 'once almost forgotten every word Parson Adams ever said to (him)'. And later in chapter XI, he gives us the true cause of Joseph's chastity, that he is in love with bonny Fanny. But, in retrospect, Joseph still seems, even to the modern readers who believe in male chastity, rigid and somewhat foolish in his flat but awkward refusal of lascivious Lady Booby and cow-like monster Mrs. Slipslop. On second perusal, however, we find that it is not the intrinsic morality of Joseph that is stupid, but that the author's deliberate

handling of him makes him look ridiculous in his feint of ignorance. First, Fielding is excessively conscious of the travesty of *Pamela*; if Joseph is foolishly virtuous, Pamela is wickedly chaste. Secondly, he is of a mind to attract more attention and then to produce stronger impressions upon clever minds. Some readers might have only laughed at Joseph for his timid over-scrupulosity, but not a few must, in making fun of his absurd feint of ignorance, have felt themselves touched on the sore spot, and realized that conventional morality of Lady Booby, and therefore their own moral code, is not only ridiculed by the author, but is, in reality ridiculous and wicked.

If male chastity is important, unquestionably so is the woman's chastity. Though women were outwardly asked to be chaste, the moral convention was rather tolerant to their immorality, and not a few fashionable ladies, it seems, did not think it sinful, nay not even wicked to indulge in illicit amours. Only they would seem chaste themselves and were extremely fond of 'demolishing the reputation of others.'(I, 9) Although they blamed others for their immorality behind their back, it is not because they were really against it, but simply because they tried to avoid censure by defaming others, and then to pretend to be virtuous themselves. So long as their affairs were carried on secretly, they were safe, and so Lady Booby dared not fire Mrs. Slipslop whom she suspects to know her seduction of Joseph. What such ladies cared for was mere respectability, and they never called in question their own misdemeanours. To Fielding, not only the moral convention, but the self-deception and the pretension of the would-be respectable ladies were unpardonable. By exaggerating the virginity of a man, Fielding wants his readers to look squarely at the moral code of the day that connives at adultery.[6] Joseph is made indefatigably chaste and somewhat absurdly ignorant for the effective presentment of the problem of both male and female chastity. When Joseph next spurns the seduction by Betty the servant-maid who has been tremendously kind to him, we find him no longer ridiculous. For we are already informed that he has a beautiful bride-to-be, and then, though the author as a commentator is facetious enough to ridicule *Pamela* saying, 'How ought a man to rejoice that his chastity is always in his power, . . . and cannot, like a weak woman, be ravished against his will,'(I, 18) Fielding's manipulation of Joseph is not awkwardly ridiculous as before. Here no one will fail to perceive the serious intent of the author in representing Joseph as a champion of chastity.

After the unexpected meeting of Joseph with Parson Adams at Mrs. Tow-wouse's inn, Adams comes to the fore, and Joseph recedes to the background. Adams, whose character is 'the most glaring in the whole' (Preface), is virtually the hero of the novel, though not nominally so.[7]

Though he is in the main the author's tool for unmasking the ridiculous, Parson Adams, who is enormously proud of his learning, is not immune from the author's ridicule. He thinks 'a schoolmaster the greatest character in the world, and himself the greatest of all schoolmasters.' (III, 5) He believes in the world not of reality but of the Greek and Latin classics in which he is deeply versed, hence the conflicts

between those who believe in the world as it appears and the Don Quixote of England as he goes along the road. A debate between the parson and an ex-captain of a ship turned landlord is a very interesting example. Adams begins,

> 'Perhaps I have travelled a great deal farther than you without the assistance of a ship. Do you imagine sailing by different cities or countries is travelling? No. . . . I can go farther in an afternoon than you in a twelve month. Nay, you may have entered the closet where Archimedes was found at the taking of Syracuse . . . the Cyclades, the unfortunate Helle, whose fate is sweetly described by Apollonius Rudius; . . .' 'O ho! you are a very traveller,' cries the host (who at last caught him out), 'and not to know the Levant. . . . you must not talk of these things with me! you must not tip us the traveller; it won't go here.'(II, 17)

Adams firmly believes that the travelling in books is the only way of acquiring knowledge, and that the classical world is entirely adaptable to the present, or rather, it is more real than that which lies before his eyes. On the contrary, the landlord absolutely believes in what he really sees and utterly discards the imaginary world of Adams. So, Adams finds the host 'so dull', while the host in turn considers the parson to be a humbug. But we know that Fielding is laughing at both of them. We side with the ex-captain when he says that 'a very petty knowledge of trade' is obtainable even if one cannot read or write, and thinks Adams ridiculous who answers, 'Trade, as Aristotle proves in his first chapter of Politics is below a philosopher, and unnatural as it is managed now.' On the other hand, we cannot but agree to the assertion of the latter that 'if a man should sail round and anchor in every harbour of it, without learning, he would return home as ignorant as he went out.' Here the readers suspect as in *Don Quixote* that the tangible world that presents itself is not real and that the truth lies somewhere behind it. Here they learn the absurdity of implicit belief in 'appearance'. Thus, this incident plays a part in the whole problem of 'reality' and 'appearance'.

Now, Parson Adams believes not only in the classical world, but also in the world of Christianity. He takes it for granted that people put into practice the teachings of the Bible, which everyone pretends to do, but, in reality, very few adhere to. Adams is 'as entirely ignorant of the ways of this world, as an infant just entered into it could possible be,' (I, 3) so what he sees and hears outside his parish are cruel enough to make him suspect more than once that he is 'sojourning in a country inhabited only by Jews and Turks.' (II, 16)

'Charity begins at home,' remarks the man of wit who laughs at the distress of Joseph, and Mrs. Tow-wouse cries, 'Common charity, a f—t!; common charity teaches us to provide for ourselves, and our families; and I and mine won't be ruined by your charity, I assure you.' Most characters in Joseph Andrews, either for the sake of their own comfort, or for the showing-off of their superiority, or for love of money, are

extrerely indifferent and insensible to the human misery. There is no fellow-feeling, nor any sense of solidarity among the people, and the author is forced to say that 'so far from looking on each other as brethren in the Christian language, they seem scarce to regard each other as of the same species.' (II, 13) Fielding is quite indignant at this, whose maxim for the human conduct is, as he cites in "An Essay on Conversation", the Golden Rule in Scripture that tells us to 'Do unto all men as you would they should unto you.'[8] Lip piety and no practice is what Fielding most detests. 'Charity begins at home,' is the motto also of the porcine parson Trulliber who first takes Adams for a hog-dealer. He boasts of having large sum of money, and roars, 'what matters where a man's treasure is, whose heart is in the Scripture? There is the treasure of a Christian.' But when Adams in a rapture asks him to lend only fourteen shillings, Trulliber cries to the astonishment of Adams, that 'I won't give thee a farthing. . . . I know what charity is, better than to give to vagabonds.' After much dispute between them, Adams bids the other parson not to name Scripture, for, says he,

> 'Now, there is no command more express, no duty more frequently enjoined, than charity. Whoever therefore is void of charity, I make no scruple of pronouncing that he is no Christian.' (II, 14)

This is also the author's conception of what a Christian ought to be. He should be benevolent, kind to his neighbours, and very sympathetic with the distress of the fellow men. Lack of charity is the most odious vice, and the pretender to charity is the most detestable wretch. Though always poor for his lack of the worldly knowledge and experience, Parson Adams is full of Christian love for his brethren, never afraid of being involved in difficulties, nor can be indifferent to the misfortunes of the others.

'The ridiculers of Adams are the proper object of ridicule,' says Stuart Tave,[9] and this interpretation of Adams as a measure for all the other characters is quite right. According to Walter Allen, Adams is 'the reagent submission to which exposes the true nature and composition of the rest of the dramatis personae.'[10] For the most part, he is. But at the same time, it must be added, 'the reagent' is not always a mere passive 'measuring rod'. We must also note that he is sometimes very aggressive as in the quarrel with Parson Trulliber, and is a brilliant example of benevolence and good-nature. Though his extreme poverty reduces his opportunities for bestowing charity in the sense of almsgiving, he is overflowing with charity in the original sense of the word, namely the Christian love of the fellow men. He deeply sympathizes with the human affliction, and gets transported with joy at the happiness of others. Thus, when the man with a gun runs away for fear at a woman's scream for help, Adams with no weapon but a crab-stick rushes to her rescue. At the happy reunion of the young lovers, he dances about the room in a rapture of joy, regardless of his dearest Aeschylus expiring in the fire. And the hearty welcome he receives on entering his

parish well testifies to his constant love and kindness to the parishioners, who in turn respect him like dutiful children. When such persons as man of wit, Mrs. Tow-wouse and Trulliber speak of charity, they only mean the act of almsgiving. As they frequently talk of 'a Christian' without understanding what it really means, so the essential signification of 'charity' is found out to be quite out of their reach. Besides, even charity in the limited sense of almsgiving is not the matter of practice but the matter only of knowledge. Adams, on the other hand, not only knows charity in its true and full sense, of which almsgiving is an indispensable part, but he positively practises it; he is no inanimate 'measuring rod'.

Though Adams successively finds with shock of recognition the wickedness and cruelty of human heart, his belief in Scripture never wavers. On the contrary, he soars, high above the others in the end. As the vehement controversies between Adams and other parsons show us, he never is a passive, compromising curate 'where the least spice of religion intervenes', while outside the sheer question of Christian faith, he has been to a considerable degree awkward, clumsy, and sometimes at a loss what to do. At the concluding chapters, however, probably owing to the experiences he has got during the journey, he knows well how to cope with the reality that tries to destroy and mar the world of God's creation. When Lady Booby orders Adams to publish the banns no more for Joseph and Fanny, he peremptorily declines, saying 'the parties being poor is no reason against their marrying. . . The poor have little share enough of this world already.' And when further urged with a threat that 'I will recommend it to your master the doctor, to discard you from his service, . . . notwithstanding your poor family,' he defiantly answers,

> 'I know not what your ladyship means by the term master and service. I am in the service of a Master who will never discard me for doing my duty; and if the doctor (for indeed I have never been able to pay for a licence) thinks proper to turn me out from my cure, God will provide me, I hope, another. . . . Whilst my conscience is pure, I shall never fear what man can do into me. (IV, 2)

Here Adams grows bigger than ever, and than anyone else. He is a Church Militant, with a firm conviction that he is a servant only of the Highest. This belief in benevolent God who is in heaven and the determination to defy what is of the earth earthy are, along with the emphasis on charity and chastity, the religious basis of both Adams and our author. Fielding is, after all, a devout Christian, and his humanitarianism is firmly based on Scripture that expressly professes the love of one's fellow men.

The professed thematic motif of unmasking the affectation of would-be Christians is inseparably linked with the antitheic thematic motif of positively setting forth the examples of a virtuous Christian. Whereas the affected have checked the spontaneous flow of good-nature on the principle of self-love and become callous and unchris-

tian, Joseph and Adams who stand for Fielding's idea of Virtue never, though Adams is sometimes too proud, put on anything that, blocking up the flow of good-nature, makes them cruel to their fellow creatures. Fielding says that true virtue is only found in those who wear no masks of affectation, and who show free and full display of their nature which he believes is naturally disposed to be good.

IV

Joseph, after only several days' journey, has also grown to be an active and confident youth. Critics name only Tom and Captain Booth as men altered in the end after having experienced the hardships of life. And indeed, his transfiguration may not be so convincing since the most glaring character during the journey, which in retrospect is the symbol of life, is not Joseph but Parson Adams. Nevertheless, he is intended to be, and is an altered man in the end. Though a man of honour and chastity, the lad in the early chapters is, in a sense, a tool for the burlesque of *Pamela,* and for exaggeration's sake, somewhat absurd and awkward. When the parody of *Pamela* is again taken up in the last Book, not as a plain and coarse ridicule but rather as a foil to the main theme of the novel, Joseph is not what he has been. In Book I, he could only write to his sister and lament 'o Pamela, my Mistress . . . has a mind to ruin me.' He is now able to reproach Pamela openly for her contempt of Fanny, and when Mr. Booby expostulates with him that he should give up Fanny since such a match 'would break the hearts of (his) parents, who now rejoice in the expectation of seeing (Joseph) make a figure in the world,' Joseph definitely replies,

> 'I know not . . . that my parents have any power over my inclinations; nor am I obliged to sacrifice my happiness to their whim; . . . I am resolved on no account to quit my dear Fanny; . . . for all my pleasure is centred in Fanny; and whilst I have health, I shall be able to support her with all my labour in that station of life to which she was born, and with which she is content. (IV, 7)

Joseph is now an independent adult. He knows what he is, what he ought to do, where his felicity lies, what love and marriage mean both to himself and to his beloved. He is sure of the wickedness and futility of 'prudent marriages' of the high people through which some aim at amassing estates and riches, and others seek to rise high in status. Mutual affection is the first requisite to a happy conjugal life. He is well aware of the importance and happiness of earning bread by the sweat of his brow for his family. Furthermore, he can even refute his teacher Abraham Adams when the parson admonishes him to conquer the passions of love by reason and grace since they are foolish and wrong, and moreover 'savour too much of the flesh.' (IV, 8) Joseph at once sees through the deception and falsity of Adams's expostulation, and cries, 'Sure, sir, it is not sinful to love my wife, no not even to doat on her to destruction!' To which

Adams answers, 'if a man does not love his wife with moderation, it is sinful.' When Adams still clings in this way to the affectation of sheer doctrinal formalism ignoring the natural flow of love and good-nature which he has taken every opportunity to display, no one but his wife who happens to overhear him gives him away.

> 'Indeed,' says Mrs. Adams, . . . 'you talk more foolishly. . . . If I knew you had such a sermon in the house, I am sure I would burn it ; and I declare, if I had not been convinced you had loved me as well as you could, I can answer for myself I should have hated and despised you. . . . Besides, I am certain you do not preach as you practise; for you have been a loving and a cherishing husband to me, that' s the truth on't; and why you should endeavour to put such wicked nonsense into this young man's head, I cannot devise. Don't hearken to him, Mr. Joseph, be as good a husband as you are able, and love your wife with all your body and soul too.' (IV, 8)

To love one's beloved with all one's body and soul is the basic love ethic of Fielding, which is to be expounded more maturely and passionately in *Tom Jones* and *Amelia.* He is sure of the utter fruitlessness, futility and wickedness of simply satisfying one's carnal appetite, and Lady Booby, Mrs. Slipslop, the squire who tries to carry off Fanny are all frustrated in their desire and design. Poor Betty is no exception. But Fielding by no means denies the pleasure of the flesh in the loving couple. It is 'so great and sweet' where the conjugal affection is pure and sincere. When Joseph and Fanny are at last to consummate marriage, Fielding frankly tells us,

> Joseph no sooner heard she was in bed, than he fled with the utmost eagerness to her. A minute carried him to her arms, where we shall leave this happy couple to enjoy the private *rewards of their constancy;*[11] rewards so great and sweet, that I apprehend Joseph neither envied the noble duke, nor Fanny the finest duchess, that night. (IV, 16)

The physical pleasure is delicious between man and wife who know their felicity lies only in each other, and it enhances at the same time the pure love in each breast. It is indispensable for the full completion of matrimonial love. In an introductory chapter of *Tom Jones,* Fielding, after discriminating the 'desire of satisfying a voracious appetite with a certain quantity of delicate white human flesh' from the 'love for which I am an advocate,' declares,

> This love . . . is very apt, towards its complete gratification, to call in the aid of that hunger which I have mentioned above (i.e. flesh appetite); and which it is so far from abating, that it heightens all its delight to a degree scarce imaginable by those who have never been susceptible of any other emotions, than what have

proceeded from appetite alone. (IV, 1)

The often rebuked history of Mr. Wilson, a retired gentleman, is a splendid example of the married love that Fielding is setting forth in the novel.[12] It is not a mere digression nor a personal narrative of an unimportant character that romance writers frequently availed themselves of. It is not merely relevant to the 'principal design' of the novel as an unmasking of the cruelty and vanity of the city life; it presents the author's idea of love and marriage in a desirable condition. Mr. Wilson says that 'his happiness consists entirely in his wife, whom he loves with an inexpressible fondness, which is perfectly returned.' He is fond of conversing with his wife who is 'a faithfuller and braver friend,' and of playing with 'the fruits of their embraces.' He is proud of working in the fields for his dear wife and children who in turn love and respect him. He believes that calm serene happiness which is seated in contentment, lies in the retired life with one's beloved (and then with their children). Parson Adam's declaration that 'this is the manner in which the people lived in the Golden Age,' at once tells us that this is Fielding's idea of the Uptopian way of life.

Needless to say, his exhortation of retirement from a world full of bustle, noise, hatred, envy and ingratitude is nothing original. As Basil Willey points out that 'the philosophical passion for the best-of-possible-worlds could already, in the opening eighteenth century, pass into fondness for the "country" and for what is "natural", in contrast with town life and the "artificial",' we may say retirement was one of the commonest subjects among the contemporaries of Fielding. But according to Willey and Tillyard,[13] retirement was set forth, in general, as a means to 'study the glories of God as revealed in nature and to contemplate the approach of death,"[14] and so it mostly meant a single retirement. Fielding's retirement seems somewhat different, in his insistence on the country not as a proper place for contemplation but as the only place where the happy conjugal life, full of respect and affection, is possible. Digeon attributes Fielding's preference of country to town to his childhood experiences in the country, and says that it 'will never be the mechanical repetitions of the commonplaces to be found in every Latin poet.'[15] His biography tells us that when Henry was two and a half years old, his father Edmund settled as a gentleman farmer at East Stour where he was to spend his childhood. Yet, we must not overestimate this difference, for 'the idea of retirement from the world is a human constant,'[16] and in spite of Digeon's defence, the classics have quite a lot of their examples of happy family life in retirement,[17] and it was after all one of the great eighteenth-century myths.

Joseph, as we have discussed, is always pure in his love for Fanny, and at the end of the journey which is symbolic of life with its hardships, he grows big and is sure of life and love. He well knows what true love is, and denounces both surreptitious illicit amours and marriage based not on mutual love but on such things as desire for status, riches, estates and the rest. He disdains to get worldly rewards through his marriage, and all he wishes is that he will be able to support dearest Fanny, with all his labour,

in that station to which she was born and with which she is content. Here no one will fail to sense the parody of *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* whose heroine is by no means unaware of the worldly reward for her virginity. But we must note that Fielding makes use of *Pamela* only as a foil to his idea of true "Virtue and Love" which Joseph represents, and that as a "Reward" he lets Joseph enter a retired life in the country with his beloved wife which Fielding believes is the true and best way of life. This, he seems to declare, is the "true Virtue, truely Rewarded."

(To be continued.)

Notes.

1 Referring to Battestin's 'Fielding's Revisions of *Joseph Andrews'*, Wright says, *'(Joseph Andrews)* is not always flawless, but it is *arranged* in a way that *Don Quixote* is not.' (*Mask And Feast,* p. 29)

cf. Note 7 (Battestin)

2 The passage is also quoted by John Butt for the explanation of the seemingly 'picaresque' adventures of *Joseph Andrews. Fielding* (London, 1954) As to what 'the great end' is, Butt just mentions 'the display of the Ridiculous.' He views the episode of Mr. Wilson in this light, saying that its purpose is to introduce the wicked life of London.

3 *Studies in Humanities, College of Liberal Arts, Kanazawa Univ. 25-2,* (1988)

4 Digeon, p. 53

5 As to the parallel between 'Joseph-Booby' and 'JOSEPH-Potiphar's wife,' Battestin gives a convincing analysis. *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art; A study of Joseph Andrews* (Connecticut, 1959) He argues that Fielding's use of Biblical analogues for JOSEPH Andrews and for ABRAHAM Adams as well was influenced by published homiletics by Latitudinarians such as Barrow, Clarke, South and Hoadly. pp. 26-43, 85-103 I owe much to his essay in the interpretation of Joseph and Adams as the paragons of good Christians.

Maurice Johnson, quoting from Battestin, adds that 'Fielding's comic Biblical mythology may equally stem from sermons by divines like Whitefield with whom he was generally in disagreement.' *Fielding's Art of Fiction* (Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania P., 1961) p. 51

6 Fielding was extremely horrified at the moral decay, and later Dr. Harrison, his spokesman, after deploring the prevalence of adultery even among the clergymen, says, 'What wonder, then, if community in general treat this monstrous crime as a matter of jest, and that men give way to the temptations of a violent appetite, when the indulgence of it is protected by law and countenanced by custom?' (Amelia, IX, 5) Some critics point out that Fielding consciously uses 'the apprehension of incest' device both in *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* in order to show that there is little difference between incest and adultery.

7 Battestin says that 'the structure of Joseph Andrews, despite incidental flaws, is not so haphazard, but rather consciously contrived and symmetrical,' (*Moral Basis,* p. 9) and that the novel is quite under the control of the author. There still remains the fact that the professed hero and heroine are Joseph and Lady Booby. (I , 8)

8 *Miscellanies* (1743), Wesleyan Edition, p. 124

9 Stuart Tave; *The Amiable Humorists* (Chicago, 1959) p.144

Walter Allen; *The English Novel,* p. 56 And, I must add, this is one of the chief roles most picaresque heroes take upon themselves.

11 One is reminded of Richardson's title.

12 Wright, p. 65, referring to Wilson and the final disclosure of his paternity to Joseph, says 'here is presented incontrovertible evidence of attention to plot.' He points out that the interpolated story of Wilson has not merely a thematic connection; it is so closely connected to the main line of the action.

13 Basil Willey; *The Eighteenth-Century Background* (Penguin Books, 1962; first published by Chatto and Windus, 1940) p. 65

14 E. M. Tillyard; *Some Mythical Elements in English Literature* (London, 1961) pp. 72 -107

15 Ibid. p. 72

16 Digeon, p. 4

17 Tillyard, p. 72

18 Battestin says that Fielding gets the retirement motif both from the classics and from the homiletics of his day. *(Moral Basis,* pp. 44-51)